

Agreement, CAFT agreement, that does not protect against piracy of copyright. Well and good. Who determines that? How does it get determined? How do we know if we are making sufficient progress during the negotiations to know whether or not we could be expending any funds that does not open markets for the United States agricultural products and high technology and other manufactured products.

Does that mean that only if it opens markets for our products? Does it mean it cannot open our doors for products from other countries coming into the United States? Is this supposed to be just under this? Is USTR supposed to assume it has to be a one-way trade agreement that is to be negotiated, that provides for greater rights for foreign investors? What are greater rights? What does that mean? Cannot provide for greater rights for foreign investors than U.S.? Do we have to compare each tax law? How do we compare the tax laws as opposed to our own tax laws? How are they supposed to know?

The point of all of this, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am trying to make here, is that what we are talking about here is a negotiating process. We are talking about the U.S. Trade Representative entering into a negotiation. And when you enter into negotiations, you cannot prejudge and say that at the outset it has to be better than it was before in all agricultural products. It has to provide for more protection for U.S. investors than for other investors.

And how are they supposed to know day by day during this negotiation whether they are allowed to expend funds?

It is a completely unworkable kind of amendment that is being offered here today. So just on the surface of this amendment it is something that could not really possibly work. The bottom line is we all want to have protection for investors, protection for copyrights, open access to markets in other countries.

But we are also talking about some of the least developed countries, certainly, in this hemisphere, some of the lesser-developed countries in the world. And part of what we want to do with these trade agreements is give them an opportunity to have economic growth, give them an opportunity to hope for the future, give them a hand up, not a hand out, hold our hand out to them with open trade, with open markets; not to keep giving them more assistance that only robs them of the ability to send their markets, send their products to our markets.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what we are talking about with these free trade agreements.

I am reminded finally of how the head of the international labor organizations at one time with the group of members of this body was being questioned about labor rights and what

kind of labor rights should exist in other countries; and he finally said, We want jobs, of course, we want good jobs in these Latin American countries, but first we have to have the job before we can talk about how we protect that job, before we can talk about having worker protections and building on that and making those jobs better and providing for more rights for our workers. First, we have to have the jobs.

□ 2215

That is what we are talk about with CAFTA and the FTAA. We are talking about providing these jobs for people there, giving them a chance, giving them hope for the future. Let us not rob them of that hope. Let us not do the Central American Free Trade Agreement; let us not do the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas with an amendment like this.

Tomorrow we will make our points of order on the issue itself as to whether this amendment should be in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time except for the 1 minute that remains.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2799) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RAISE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privilege of the House. The form of my resolution is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION—

Whereas during a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1776, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

Whereas during the reading of that amendment the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee directed majority staff of the committee to ask the United States Capitol Police to remove minority-party members of the committee from a room of the committee during the meeting, causing the United States Capitol Police thereupon to confront the minority-party members of the committee;

Whereas pending a unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of that amendment the chairman deliberately and improperly refused to recognize a legitimate and timely objection by a member of the committee;

Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives disapproves of the manner in which Representative Thomas summoned the United States Capitol Police to evict minority-party members of the Committee on Ways and Means from the committee library, as well as the manner in which he conducted the markup of legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means on July 18, 2003, and finds that the bill considered at that markup was not validly ordered reported to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Michigan will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PLAN COLOMBIA/ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE SEMI-ANNUAL OBLIGATION REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 3204(e), Public Law 106-246, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration detailing the progress of spending by the executive branch during the first two quarters of Fiscal Year 2003 in support of Plan Colombia.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2003.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, the Child Tax Credit bill. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

One, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report

the provision of the Senate amendment not included in the House amendment that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

Two, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment, not included in the House amendment, that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

Three, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

Four, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

Five, the House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ross moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

Number one, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment not included in the House amendment that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

Number two, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individual serving in the combat zone.

Number three, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

Number four, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families

of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

Finally, number five, the House conferees shall, as soon as practicable, after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees, and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7(b) of rule XXII, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) and a Member of the opposite party, in this case the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), each will control 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I am offering a motion to instruct conferees on the child tax credit. As Congress considered H.R. 2, the Jobs and Growth Tax Reconciliation Act, at a cost of more than \$300 billion, one important provision was omitted that affects a majority of the hardworking families in my home State of Arkansas, as well as working families across our Nation.

The increase of a child tax credit that could be refundable to include low- to moderate-income families who earn between \$10,500 a year and \$26,625 a year was dropped from the conference agreement. Wage earners in this group include our men and women in the military, police officers, firefighters, and even our school teachers. Expanding the child tax credit to include the families of these people made up only 1 percent, let me repeat that, made up only 1 percent of the total cost of the tax cut package; but the impact of this omission on the millions of working families who need this relief is immeasurable.

I am very proud of our senior Senator from Arkansas, BLANCHE LINCOLN, who led the effort in the United States Senate to correct this wrong, to right this wrong; and the Senate did so in a bipartisan way. The vote in the Senate was 94 to 2. Let me repeat that: in the Senate it was a bipartisan vote, 94 to 2.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply wrong. It is wrong to enact a tax cut in the name of economic relief and not give that relief to those who are trying to do the right thing and stay off welfare and work jobs with few or no benefits, struggling day in and day out to make ends meet and provide for their children and their families.

At the end of this week, some 25 million checks will be printed and put in the mail. Soon, the 25 million families who qualify under the new tax cut law will begin to receive those checks for child tax credits aimed at providing them with economic relief. This means that a mother of two who earns \$65,000 a year will soon find an extra \$800 in her mailbox. Meanwhile, a mother of two who earns up to \$26,625 will get absolutely nothing, not one dime.

We had to explain today to a single mother from my congressional district

back home, Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District, who earns \$16,000 a year, she was under the impression that she would be getting the child tax credit. After all she works for a living; she pays taxes and wanted our office to settle an argument with a friend who insisted that she did not qualify. Even though she is trying to do the right thing and stay off welfare, her friend told her she does not make enough money to get money back in terms of a child tax credit.

We had to tell her that she lost that argument; and because House Republicans, this Republican national leadership has yet to act on a bipartisan, Senate-passed provision, I repeat again on a 94 to 2 vote in the United States Senate, a bipartisan vote, because the House has refused to act on the Senate version, she will be left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, if we act now, we can include some 6.5 million working families who need this help the most.

This motion to instruct does a few simple things. It tells the conferees to agree to the Senate language, the bipartisan language that passed the Senate 94 to 2. It tells the conferees to let this language provide for tax credit checks to be mailed immediately to low-income family, those earning up to \$26,625 a year. It provides that the tax credit be extended to personnel in combat zones in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere around the globe. It provides assistance for the families of those who died in the tragic Columbia shuttle disaster, and yes, it ensures that this minimal cost is fully offset. In other words, we are not adding to the national deficit through this motion to instruct.

□ 2230

The conferees could easily accomplish these changes and bring us a final bill within 2 days, which is what this motion calls for.

For those who argue that a tax cut should not be provided for those who do not pay taxes, I am here tonight to say that that dog won't hunt. We are not talking about a tax credit for welfare recipients. We are talking about a tax cut for working families. There are hard-working people in our own offices who fall in this income level. Check out their next pay stub and tell me that they do not pay taxes.

Working individuals who pay a significant part of their income in taxes, including Social Security and Medicare taxes and gas taxes and sales taxes and property taxes, taxes which are never cut, should be entitled to share in the benefits of a tax cut, particularly since it is their Social Security Trust Fund, their children's Social Security Trust Fund, and their grandchildren's Social Security Trust Fund that is being raided to pay for this tax cut for the wealthy.

It is only fair that tax cuts benefit all Americans who contribute. Let us right the wrong and make sure that those 76,000 working families in my